BEFORE THE TENNESSEE STATE BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

IN RE:	Jayantilal V. & Husumati Patel	,
	Map 106-00-0, Parcel 27.01) Davidson County
	Commercial Property)
	Tax Year 2005	· ,

INITIAL DECISION AND ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

Statement of the Case

An appeal has been filed on behalf of the property owner with the State Board of Equalization. The undersigned administrative judge conducted a hearing in this matter on May 30, 2006 in Nashville, Tennessee. In attendance at the hearing were Jayantilal Patel, George Patel, Al Patel, and Davidson County Property Assessor's representative Dennis Donovan, MAI.

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The sole issue before the administrative judge concerns jurisdiction. This issue arises from the fact the disputed appraisal was not appealed to the Metropolitan Board of Equalization.

The administrative judge finds that Tennessee law requires a taxpayer to appeal an assessment to the County Board of Equalization prior to appealing to the State Board of Equalization. Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 67-5-1401 & 67-5-1412(b). A direct appeal to the State Board is permitted only if the assessor does not timely notify the taxpayer of a change of assessment prior to the meeting of the County Board. Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 67-5-508(a)(3) & 67-5-903(c). Nevertheless, the legislature has also provided that:

The taxpayer shall have right to a hearing and determination to show reasonable cause for the taxpayer's failure to file an appeal as provided in this section and, upon demonstrating such reasonable cause, the [state] board shall accept such appeal from the taxpayer up to March 1 of the year subsequent to the year in which the assessment was made.

Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1412(e). The Assessment Appeals Commission, in interpreting this section, has held that:

The deadlines and requirements for appeal are clearly set out in the law, and owners of property are charged with knowledge of them. It was not the intent of the 'reasonable cause' provisions to waive these requirements except where the failure to meet them is due to illness or other circumstances beyond the taxpayer's control.

Associated Pipeline Contractors, Inc., Williamson County, Tax Year 1992, Assessment Appeals Commission (Aug. 11, 1994). See also John Orovets, Cheatham County, Tax Year

1991, Assessment Appeals Commission (Dec. 3, 1993). Thus, for the State Board of Equalization to have jurisdiction in this appeal, the taxpayer must show that circumstances beyond his control prevented him from appealing to the Metropolitan Board of Equalization.

The taxpayer testified that he entrusted his teenage son to oversee subject property because he resides at another hotel he owns in Goodlettsville, Tennessee. According to Mr. Patel, his son "missed" the assessment change notice. It was not until late December that Mr. Patel realized his appraisal had increased and he initiated this appeal.

The administrative judge finds the taxpayer failed to establish that he was prevented from appealing to the Metropolitan Board of Equalization due to circumstances beyond his control. Respectfully, the administrative judge finds that a reasonably prudent businessman would not entrust a teenager with such matters or at least more closely supervise such an employee.

Based upon the foregoing, the administrative judge finds that the taxpayer failed to establish reasonable cause for not appealing to the Metropolitan Board of Equalization and the State Board of Equalization therefore lacks jurisdiction.

ORDER

It is therefore ORDERED that this appeal be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that any applicable hearing costs be assessed pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501(d) and State Board of Equalization Rule 0600-1-.17.

Pursuant to the Uniform Administrative Procedures Act, Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 4-5-301—325, Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501, and the Rules of Contested Case Procedure of the State Board of Equalization, the parties are advised of the following remedies:

- 1. A party may appeal this decision and order to the Assessment Appeals Commission pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 67-5-1501 and Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization. Tennessee Code Annotated § 67-5-1501(c) provides that an appeal "must be filed within thirty (30) days from the date the initial decision is sent." Rule 0600-1-.12 of the Contested Case Procedures of the State Board of Equalization provides that the appeal be filed with the Executive Secretary of the State Board and that the appeal "identify the allegedly erroneous finding(s) of fact and/or conclusion(s) of law in the initial order"; or
- 2. A party may petition for reconsideration of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-317 within fifteen (15) days of the entry of the order. The petition for reconsideration must state the specific grounds upon which relief is requested. The filing of a petition for reconsideration is not a prerequisite for seeking administrative or judicial review; or

3. A party may petition for a stay of effectiveness of this decision and order pursuant to Tenn. Code Ann. § 4-5-316 within seven (7) days of the entry of the order.

This order does not become final until an official certificate is issued by the Assessment Appeals Commission. Official certificates are normally issued seventy-five (75) days after the entry of the initial decision and order if no party has appealed.

ENTERED this 1st day of June, 2006.

MARK J. MINSKY

ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGE

TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES DIVISION

c: Jayantilal V. & Husumati Patel Jo Ann North, Assessor of Property